ESO #981

An Assessment of the Influence of Peer Association and Identification on Drug Use Among Rural High School Students[1]

Ted L. Napier
Ohio State University

Richard Goe
Ohio State University

Douglas C. Bachtel
University of Georgia

Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center and the Ohio State University, 2120 Fyffe Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210

Paper presented at the 1983 Annual Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists Meeting. Atlanta, Georgia. February 1983.

ABSTRACT

Data were collected in 1981 from 4,859 junior and senior high school students living in two counties in southern Georgia to examine the relationship of peer group influence and psychosocial identification with the frequency of drug use. Practically all of the students in grades 8 through 12 in two study counties were interviewed in controlled group sessions during regularly scheduled school hours. All of the interviews were conducted simultaneously in each selected school to prevent biasing of responses due to the diffusion of study contents among student participants. Information regarding the type and extent of drug use was collected from the students as well as peer group relationships and psychosocial identification with various groups. These data provided the opportunity to examine the merits of a theoretical perspective developed from selected components of differential association and differential identification theories. Factor analysis was used to build two composite dependent variables from the drug use data. The two dependent variables were termed soft drug use and hard drug use. The variance in each of the dependent variables was regressed against selected associational and identification variables. The regression analyses revealed that 18 variables explained 72.2 percent of the variance in soft drug use (4 variables explained 68.4 percent) while 9 variables explained 62.6 percent of the variance in hard drug use (4 variables explained 61.4 percent). The findings basically support the theoretical perspective as stated.

Introduction

Numerous research efforts have been undertaken in recent years to identify the correlates of illegal drug use in the U.S. (Adler and Lotecka, 1973; Blackford, 1977; Blum, 1969; Burkett and White, 1974; Cushman, 1971; Fischler, 1975-76; Forslund, 1977-78; Gersick, et al., 1981; Harrell and Cisin, 1981; Ianni, 1973; Inciardi and Chambers, 1972; Josephson, 1971; Judd, et al., 1973; Kandel, 1976; Lombrillo and Hain, 1972; Marden and Kolodner, 1977; McIntosh, et al., 1981; Napier and Pratt, 1982; Napier, et al., 1981; Patch, 1973; Pittel, 1973; Schumann and Polkowski, 1975). These studies provide useful descriptive information regarding illegal drug use but few contribute to explanations of why drug abuse occurs because they do not appear to be guided by theoretical modeling. Quite often illegal drug use research is spawned by very pragmatic program needs rather than scientifically inspired inquiry. Subsequently, the type of data collected to address the needs of drug abuse agencies or concerned citizen groups may not be appropriate for addressing the causes of illegal drug use behavior. The end result of such a research tradition is that we have a great deal of descriptive data about many subpopulations in the society and have identified many of the correlates of illegal drug use without actually understanding why the variables covary in the manner they do. The state of the art will not change until research is conceptualized and implemented via theoretical modeling.

One of the research objectives of this paper is to examine the frequency of illegal drug use in the context of differential association theory which has been widely acclaimed in criminology. References have

been made obliquely to differential association or elements of the model in the existing literature when research findings show that peer group influences are important predictors of illegal drug use but systematic investigation of the theory has not been undertaken to our knowledge.

A second contribution of this paper is associated with the nature of the study population. The greatest majority of illegal drug use research has been conducted among urban populations with relatively little attention given to nonmetropolitan people (Fischler, 1975-76; Forslund, 1977-78; Heiligman, 1973; Kirk, 1979; Napier, et al., 1982; Napier and Pratt, 1982; Johnson, et al., 1979; National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse,1972;1973; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1981). Recent research conducted among rural populations, however, suggests that the rates of illegal drug use are quite high (Kirk, 1979; Napier and Pratt, 1982; Napier, et al., 1981; Napier, et al., 1982) and may be converging with the rates of urban groups (Harrell and Cisin, 1981; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1981). These findings are quite significant since earlier research revealed that rural populations exhibited low rates of illegal drug use compared with urban people (Fischler, 1975-76; Forslund, 1977-78; Heiligman, 1973; Johnston, et al., 1979; National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, 1972;1973; Tolone and Dermott, 1975). Such findings suggest that rural drug use is increasing more rapidly than urban rates which implies that a serious drug problem may be emerging in rural areas.

Given the research objectives and the inadequacies noted in the existing illegal drug use literature, the contributions of this paper are twofold: 1) a systematic investigation of the differential association

model as it relates to illegal drug use; and 2) the examination of illegal drug use among rural people.

A Theoretical Perspective of Illegal Drug Use

Differential Association Models

While many factors have been shown to be significantly associated with illegal drug use among young people living in the U.S., the relationship between illegal drug use and peer group associations has been shown to be consistently important (Akers, et al., 1979; Johnston, et al., 1979; Kirk, 1979; Linder, et al., 1974; National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, 1972;1973; Smart, 1976; Sorosiak, et al., 1976; Tolone and Dermott, 1975). Such findings should not be surprising since early theoretical work by Sutherland (1939) posited that association with deviants contributes to participation in criminal actions. The theoretical perspective became known as differential association theory of criminal behavior and was widely acclaimed (Akers, 1973; Glaser, 1956-60; Sutherland, 1939; Sutherland and Cressey, 1978).

Differential association theory basically argues that interaction with persons engaged in deviant behavior or with those who have a propensity to engage in deviant actions contributes to the formation of attitudes and perceptions which are conducive to participation in similar deviant acts. It is also posited that individuals who do not participate in the deviant acts will be socially coerced to do so as a result of a desire to be accepted by the deviant actors. Noncompliance with the reference group's expectations would be perceived negatively and the nonconformist to the group's desires and/or expectations would be sanctioned negatively. If nonparticipants wish to be accepted by the deviant actors, they will become engaged in the deviant activity.

Since all behavior is learned, association with individuals engaged in specific deviant actions facilitates the learning of deviant behavior. Of equal importance is the establishment and reinforcement of favorable definitions toward violation of established normative structure. Therefore, association with individuals who practice illegal drug use and/or those who establish informal, primary group norms supporting participation in illegal drug consumption is highly conducive to illegal drug use. Such individuals or groups provide the necessary information associated with means of accessing illegal drugs, appropriate techniques for consumption of the illegal drugs, and the social environment to try drugs and to continue consumption. This line of reasoning suggests that association with individuals or groups engaged in illegal drug use contributes to illegal drug use. Persons who associate with individuals or groups actively engaged in illegal drug use or with individuals or groups which exhibit a propensity to engage in such behavior via attitudes, values and beliefs will tend to use illegal drugs more frequently.

Differential Identification Models

Glaser (1956, 1960) took Sutherland's (1939) model and added another dimension to the theory which was termed differential identification (Glaser, 1956: 440-41). The additional component basically suggests that psychosocial identification with deviant individuals or lifestyles is an important factor in a person's criminality eventhough the individual does not have direct contact with a deviant actor. Glaser suggests that deviant behavior can emerge as a function of exposure to the mass media or as a result of an imagined role model or lifestyle. In essence, an individual's behavior can be affected by real or imagined people and/or role models which have never been personally encountered. Such identifications are important,

however, since individuals tend to enact behavior consistent with their perceptions of reality and with their significant others. The differential identification perspective basically argues that if young people perceive their role models or reference groups (both real and imagined) as supporting illegal drug use, they will be more inclined to engage in the deviant action. Thus, it is hypothesized that measures of differential identification will be significantly related to the frequency of illegal drug use. Persons who identify with individuals and/or groups which use illegal drugs or with individuals and/or groups which condone the use of illegal substances will tend to use illegal drugs more frequently.

Discussion of Study Variables

The selection of variables for investigation was guided by the theoretical perspective outlined above. Two theoretical constructs compose the basic underpinnings of the theoretical model and factors were selected to represent each of these constructs. The two constructs are differential association and differential identification. The variables chosen to represent differential association are: church attendance, dating frequency, number of school activities, friends use drugs, wish for acceptance by reference group, friends do not use drugs, and the situational drug use variables. The variables selected to represent differential identification are: religious commitment, identification with team sports groups, identification with rock music listening groups, identification with 4-wheel drive groups, identification with organized music groups, identification with college bound groups, identification with religious groups, identification with school club groups, identification with pothead groups, and identification with soul music groups.

Within the differential association model it is recognized that associations can serve to encourage or discourage deviant behavior. If a person's reference groups support participation in deviant behavior, the individual will have a higher propensity to become engaged in deviant actions. On the other hand, if the reference groups reinforce societal norms, then participation in deviant behavior should be reduced.

Since the nature of the reference group is so important in terms of its influence, it was deemed necessary to include measures of both conforming and nonconforming reference groups to test the theoretical perspective. It is argued that church attendance, number of school activities, and associations with friends who do not use illegal drugs are factors that impede use of illegal drugs since the type of people encountered in such interaction circumstances would tend to negatively sanction such behavior. It is, therefore, hypothesized that these variables will be negatively related to the frequency of illegal drug use.

Variables which are subsumed under differential association and are perceived to encourage illegal drug use are: dating frequency, association with friends who use illegal drugs, wish to be accepted by reference group members who use illegal drugs, and the situational drug use variables. It is argued that these factors contribute to associations which will expose individuals to social pressures and opportunities to use illegal drugs which will result in more frequent use of illegal drugs. The situational factors are subsumed under differential association because each of the variables includes some element of group activity. It is argued that illegal drug use at home, at social events, in cars, and at friends' homes are usually enacted in the presence of others who support the use of

illegal drugs. Subsequently, it is hypothesized that these variables will be positively correlated with illegal drug use.

The logic used to advance hypotheses about specific differential identification variables is the same as the reasoning used for differential association. It is posited that certain types of psychosocial identification encourage compliance with established societal norms while other types of identifications contribute to violation of established laws. Subsequently, the differential identification factors which are argued to encourage conformity are: religious commitment, identification with team sports, identification with organized music groups, identification with college bound groups, identification with religious groups, identification with school club groups, and identification with soul music listening groups. Each of these variables contains elements of "establishment" expectations which tend to support the societal norms of compliance with established laws.

The differential identification factors which are supportive of nonconforming behavior are: identification with rock music listening groups, identification with 4-wheel drive groups, and identification with pothead groups. Each of these groups possess an element of noncompliance with established patterns. Rock music often portrays illegal drug use in a positive manner and pothead groups extol the merits of "grass" consumption. Four-wheel drive groups are founded on their release from the confines of established road systems. Subsequently, it is hypothesized that psychosocial identification with these groups will tend to be positively related to illegal drug use.

Methods Used In The Study

Study Sample

Data were collected in 1981 from 4,859 high school students living in two counties in southern Georgia. The study respondents constitute over 85 percent of all the students in grades eight through twelve in the two counties. The only students not included in the study were those enrolled in a small, private school which elected not to participate in the study and students who were absent when the data were collected. Given the high proportion of students included in the study, it is argued the sample is quite adequate to test the differential association-identification model. The characteristics of the study sample are presented in Table 1 to provide insight to the type of students composing the study group.

(Table 1 here)

The two study counties are very rural using a census definition. Agriculture is a very important industry in both counties eventhough the local economies are becoming more diversified over time due to rural industrialization. The industries being attracted are quite small which is consistent with the tradition of small, family operated firms. Both counties are in a state of transition as a result of population inmigration, diversification of the local economies, and the exposure to outside influences as a function of public research and teaching institutions being located close-by.

Data Collection Techniques

Data were collected during regularly scheduled school hours using

trained field staff to conduct group interviews. Field staff with children in high school were not permitted to conduct interviews where their children were enrolled. The field staff read each question to the group and each student entered their responses on a questionnaire in their possession. The students were cautioned not to enter any response until the question was read by the interviewer.

The students were not permitted to interact during the interview sessions. No names or codes were used during the data collection which assured the participants of complete anonymity. When the interview sessions were completed, the students placed their questionnaires in an envelope on the interviewer's desk. These procedures were carefully followed in all interviewing sessions to prevent biasing of the responses by peer pressure. The self reporting technique was selected since research has shown that it is a valid and reliable method for collecting drug use information from young people (Akers, et al., 1979; Hardt and Peterson-Hardt, 1977; Single, et al., 1975).

Measurement of Dependent Variables

Illegal drug use data were collected from the student participants by asking them to indicate how often they had tried a variety of drugs without a prescription. The drugs evaluated were: alcohol, cigarettes[2], marijuana, hashish, cocaine, amphetamines, barbiturates, hallucinogens, opiates, inhalants, heroin and methadone. Street names were provided after each class of drug to ensure the students were aware of the type of substance being assessed. There were 6 possible response categories which ranged from "never have tried," to "almost every day." The responses were weighted 1 through 6 with 1 representing "never have tried" to 6 which

represented "almost every day." This method was used rather than absolute frequency of drug use since it has been shown to produce an "almost perfect correlation" with drug use measured on a continuous variable basis (Akers, et al., 1979).

The drug use data were submitted to factor analysis using the principal component technique with orthogonal rotation. Two significant factors emerged which were named soft drug use and hard drug use. The soft drug use factor was composed of: alcohol, cigarettes, marijuana, amphetamines and barbiturates. The hard drug use factor was composed of: hashish, cocaine, amphetamines, barbiturates, hallucinogens, opiates, inhalants, heroin, and methadone. Hashish, amphetamines, and barbiturates loaded on both factors quite highly and were included in each factor since the two variables were designed to be analyzed separately.[3] Reliability of the drug use indexes were determined via item analysis since it is a much easier statistic to present and understand. The two drug use indexes were subjected to item analysis which produced a reliability coefficient (alpha) of 0.847 for the soft drug use index and a value of 0.865 for the hard drug use index. Such values indicate the items included in the indexes are highly intercorrelated and can be justifiably combined into composite indexes. The weighting factors for each of the drug responses were summed to form a composite index for subsequent statistical analyses.[4]

Measurement of Independent Variables

Church attendance was measured in terms of three response categories which ranged from never to regular attendance. No attendance was given a value of 0 while sometimes received a value of 1. Regular attendance received a value of 2.

Religious commitment was measured by asking the respondents to circle a number along a continuum of 1 to 10 with 10 representing very religious and 1 representing not religious at all.

Dating frequency was evaluated with 5 response categories which ranged from do not date which received a value of 0 to a category of 20 or more dates which received a value of 4.

Number of school activities was measured by asking the students to note how many school activities they participated in at school.

Identification with team sports, identification with rock music listening groups, identification with 4-wheel drive groups, identification with organized music groups (band), identification with college bound groups, identification with religious groups, identification with school club groups, identification with pothead groups, and identification with soul music listening groups were all measured by asking the study respondents to circle the response which best reflected how much they had in common with each of these groups. The possible responses were: "a lot," "some," and "none." The responses were weighted 1 through 3 with "a lot" equal to 3 and "none" equal to 1.

Friends use drugs was measured by asking the students what factors encouraged their use of drugs. If the respondents indicated that "all of my friends use drugs, so I use them too," then he/she received a value of 1. If they did not select this response as a reason, then they received a value of 0.

Wish for acceptance was measured by asking the students what factors encouraged their use of drugs. If the respondents indicated that "drugs help me to be accepted into the group I run around with," then they received a value of 1. If they did not select this response as a reason, then they received a value of 0.

Friends do not use drugs was measured by asking the students what factors served to prevent their use of illegal drugs. If the students selected "my friends don't use drugs, so I don't use drugs either" a value of 1 was given. If this response was not chosen as a reason, the respondent received a value of 0.

Situational measures of drug use were evaluated in the context of where the students usually took drugs. All of the drugs included in the soft drug use index and the hard drug use index were evaluated using the following places where drugs could be consumed: at home, at social events, in cars, and at friends' homes. If the student had used a particular drug at a specific place, they received a value of 1 for the variable. If they had not used the drug at a specific place, they received a value of 0. All of the values assigned to each of the soft drugs and to all of the hard drugs were summed across locations where the drug could be used and these values composed the indexes. The reliability of the indexes were calculated with item analysis. All of the alpha coefficients were of sufficient magnitude to justify use of the indexes as composite measures. The alpha coefficients for the drug use and situational use indexes are presented in Table 2.

(Table 2 here)

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive and multivariate statistics were employed to analyze the data. It was assumed that the categorical data produced metric measure (Abelson and Tukey, 1970; Kim, 1975; Labovitz, 1970) which permitted the use of parametric statistical analyses. The descriptive statistics were used to ascertain the extent of illegal drug use among the subject group.

Correlational analysis was undertaken to assess the merits of the theoretical hypotheses while regression analyses were conducted on the data set to ascertain the magnitude of the explained variance when all factors were considered simultaneously.

Findings

Descriptive Findings

The descriptive findings for the extent of illegal drug use are presented in Table 3. The data demonstrate that alcohol is the most frequently used illegal drug followed by cigarettes, marijuana, amphetamines, barbiturates, inhalants, opiates, hashish, cocaine, hallucinogens, heroin, and methadone. The greatest majority of illegal drug use is confined to the soft drugs and most of the soft drug use is concentrated in alcohol, cigarettes and marijuana. These findings demonstrate that the frequency of illegal drug use within the study counties is higher than comparable data for rural youths derived from national research (Harrell and Cisin, 1981). The extent of reported illegal drug use suggests that illegal drug use within the study counties is a social problem worthy of attention.

(Table 3 here)

The bivariate correlations between the independent and the dependent variables are presented in Table 4 and show that all of the independent variables were significantly related to both dependent variables at the .05 level except identification with soul music listening groups. All of the significant correlations were related to the dependent variable in the expected manner, therefore, the hypotheses as stated are accepted.

(Table 4 here)

Regression Findings For Soft Drug Use

The variance in the soft drug use index was regressed against all of the independent variables and the findings are presented in Table 5. The findings revealed that 18 variables were significant in reducing the unexplained variance. The coefficient of determination is 0.722 which means that a very high proportion of the variance was explained.

Given the dominance of situational drug use variables in the total model, three of the situational drug use factors were excluded from a revised regression model. Drug use at social events was maintained since it is a central measure of intensity of association which is an important concept in the test of the theoretical perspective. Sixteen variables were demonstrated to be significant in reducing the unexplained variance in the revised model. The coefficient of determination was reduced to 0.627 but the magnitude of the coefficient indicates that a majority of the variance was explained.

(Table 5 here)

Regression Findings For Hard Drug Use

The variance in the hard drug use index was regressed against all of the independent variables and the findings are presented in Table 6. The findings revealed that 9 variables were significant in reducing the unexplained variance and produced a coefficient of determination of 0.626.

A revised regression model excluding three of the situational drug use variables (hard drug use at social events was maintained in the model) was calculated and 8 variables were shown to be significant. The coefficient of determination was reduced to 0.438.

(Table 6 here)

Conclusions

The theoretical perspective as it was conceived appears to have considerable merit for explaining participation in illegal drug use. Both theoretical constructs encorporated in the theoretical perspective were shown to be useful since measures of differential association and differential identification entered the regression models. The best predictor of illegal drug use among the differential associational variables are: the situational use variables, dating frequency, church attendance, friends use drugs and wish to be accepted. The best predictors among the differential identification variables are: identification with pothead groups, religious commitment, and identification with rock music listening groups. Students who associated and/or identified with drug oriented people had a much higher probability of engaging in illegal drug use than individuals who did not exhibit these characteristics.

The study findings strongly support the perspective that the type of individuals with whom one associates and the role models one chooses for emulation will affect one's illegal drug use behavior. From a drug use prevention and/or intervention perspective, the study findings strongly suggest that illegal drug use among young people may be significantly reduced by manipulation of associational and identification variables identified in this study. All of the variables shown to be important predictors of illegal drug use in this study can be influenced by planned prevention-intervention programs. Involvement of young people in existing nondrug use oriented organizations and exposure to philosophies and belief structures which do not condone illegal drug

use should prove to be effective mechanisms for reducing illegal drug use. Exposure of young people early in their lives to role models which challenge the use of illegal drugs should prove to be an effective prevention method.

FOOTNOTES

1. The authors wish to thank Lyndal K. Napier for secretarial support during the writing phase of this study.

2. The legal age for consumption of cigarettes in Georgia is 16 years of age which means that approximately 50 percent of the sample would be permitted to consume cigarettes legally. Rather than disaggregating cigarette consumption from the analyses for separate treatment (complete replication of analyses), cigarette consumption was maintained in the analysis.

3. Since three of the variables included in each of the drug use indexes are identical, there is autocorrelation by definition. Such a situation means that one index cannot be used to predict the other.

4. A methodological experiment was conducted during the development of the dependent variables. Factor loadings derived from the factor analysis were used as compound weighting values to give differential importance to the variables composing the index which contributed most to the explanation within the factor (factor loading x weighting value assigned to drug use category). These values were summed for all variables composing each index. This technique was compared with the arbitrary weighting of the categories alone via the regression analyses of the type mentioned in the findings section of this paper. The analysis revealed that both techniques produced almost identical results. Such findings strongly suggest that the arbitrary weighting technique is not only much easier but is also as reliable as more complex factor analytic approaches to index construction.

Table 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Study Sample (N = 4,859)

Characteristic		Descriptive Data*	
		Frequency	Percentage
Age	12 years	3	0.0%
	13 years	436	9.0%
	14 years	837	17.2%
	15 years	1,076	22.1%
	16 years	1,009	20.8%
	17 years	973	20.0%
	18 years	427	8.8%
	19 and older	81	1.7%
	No data	17	0.3%
Sex	Male	2,419	49.8%
	Female	2,433	50.1%
	No data	7	0.1%
Race	White	2,969	61.1%
	Nonwhite	1,878	38.6%
	No data	12	0.2%
Grade	8th	1,027	21.1%
	9th	1,078	22.2%
	10th	1,039	21.4%
	11th	932	19.2%
	12th	779	16.0%
	No data	4	0.1%
Parents' Marital Status	Married	3,448	71.0%
	Not married	1,385	28.5%
	No data	25	0.5%
Perceived Academic Achievement	Much worse than school average	131	2.7%
	Worse than school average	409	8.4%
	About school average	2,910	59.9%
	Somewhat better than school average	1,043	21.5%
	Much better than school average	354	7.3%
	No data	12	0.2%
Migrant Status	Nonmigrant	3,232	66.5%
	Migrant	1,455	29.9%
	No data	172	3.5%
Perceived Family Income	Very Poor	49	1.0%
	Poor	98	2.0%
	Less than average	512	10.5%
	About average	2,103	43.3%
	More than average	1,498	30.8%
	Wealthy	460	9.5%
	Very wealthy	112	2.3%
	No data	27	0.6%
Family Receives Public Assistance	Yes	777	16.0%
	No	3,803	78.3%
	Don't know	255	5.2%
	No data	24	0.5%

* Percentages may not sum to 100.0 due to rounding error.

Table 2: Alpha* Coefficients of Reliability for Composite Indexes Used In The Multivariate Analyses of Drug Data (N = 4,859)

Index Name	Alpha Coefficient
Soft drug use index	0.847
Hard drug use index	0.865
Soft drug use at home index	0.655
Soft drug use at social events index	0.744
Soft drug use in car index	0.774
Soft drug use at friends' home index	0.742
Hard drug use at home index	0.675
Hard drug use at social events index	0.763
Hard drug use in car index	0.782
Hard drug use at friends' home index	0.802

*Alpha is calculated as follows:

Alpha = $\frac{K\bar{r}}{1+(K-1)\bar{r}}$ where K equals number of variables used to build the scale or index and $\bar{r}$ is the average of the zero order correlation coefficients among the variables composing the scale or index. The higher the value of alpha, the greater the reliability of the scale or index.

Table 3: Frequency Distributions (Percentages Within Parentheses*) of Illegal Drug Use Among Rural High School Students In Southern Georgia (N = 4,859)

Illegal Drug Used	Frequency of Illegal Drug Use						
	Almost Every Day	Several Times Per Week	A Few Times Per Month	A Few Times Per Year	Only Once or Twice Ever	Never Used	No Data
Alcohol	114 (2.3)	449 (9.2)	1,056 (21.7)	795 (16.4)	1,036 (21.3)	1,378 (28.4)	31 (0.6)
Cigarettes	670 (13.8)	229 (4.7)	288 (5.9)	503 (10.4)	1,313 (27.0)	1,799 (37.0)	57 (1.2)
Marijuana	186 (3.8)	280 (5.8)	408 (8.4)	372 (7.7)	519 (10.7)	3,050 (62.8)	44 (0.9)
Hashish	19 (0.4)	29 (0.6)	72 (1.5)	126 (2.6)	125 (2.6)	4,442 (91.4)	46 (0.9)
Cocaine	14 (0.3)	15 (0.3)	43 (0.9)	75 (1.5)	118 (2.4)	4,541 (93.5)	53 (1.1)
Amphetamines	63 (1.3)	71 (1.5)	213 (4.4)	193 (4.0)	240 (4.9)	4,035 (83.0)	44 (0.9)
Barbiturates	22 (0.5)	45 (0.9)	136 (2.8)	130 (2.7)	155 (3.2)	4,331 (89.1)	40 (0.8)
Hallucinogens	12 (0.2)	12 (0.2)	23 (0.5)	54 (1.1)	76 (1.6)	4,635 (95.4)	47 (1.0)
Opiates	14 (0.3)	22 (0.5)	61 (1.3)	177 (3.6)	124 (2.6)	4,413 (90.8)	48 (1.0)
Inhalants	51 (1.0)	32 (0.7)	57 (1.2)	103 (2.1)	233 (4.8)	4,338 (89.3)	45 (0.9)
Heroin	12 (0.2)	11 (0.2)	21 (0.4)	15 (0.3)	20 (0.4)	4,732 (97.4)	48 (1.0)
Methadone	14 (0.3)	10 (0.2)	13 (0.3)	16 (1.3)	20 (0.4)	4,738 (97.5)	48 (1.0)

* Percentages may not sum to 100.0 due to rounding error.

Table 4: Bivariate Correlation Coefficients Between Selected Independent Variables and Frequency of Drug Use (N = 4,859)

Predictive Variable	Soft Drug Use	Hard Drug Use
Church attendance	-0.30	-0.19
Religious commitment	-0.26	-0.16
Dating frequency	0.37	0.19
Number of school activities	-0.10	-0.07
Identification with team sports groups	-0.05	-0.04
Identification with rock music listening groups	0.29	0.20
Identification with 4-wheel drive groups	0.23	0.18
Identification with organized music groups	-0.15	-0.07
Identification with college bound groups	-0.08	-0.04
Identification with religious groups	-0.22	-0.14
Identification with school club groups	-0.10	-0.06
Identification with pothead groups	0.65	0.50
Identification with soul music listening groups	-0.02*	-0.01*
Friends use drugs	0.31	0.21
Wish to be accepted	0.29	0.22
Friends do not use drugs	-0.17	-0.08
Soft drug use at home	0.58	0.43
Soft drug use at social events	0.61	0.40
Soft drug use in cars	0.70	0.46
Soft drug use at friends' homes	0.64	0.45
Hard drug use at home	0.50	0.65
Hard drug use at social events	0.52	0.58
Hard drug use in cars	0.56	0.64
Hard drug use at friends' homes	0.59	0.66

* Not significant at the .05 level.

Table 5: Regression Analysis For Selected Independent Variables and Soft Drug Use Among Rural Youths in Georgia: Presented in Total Variable Model Form and in Revised Model Form Excluding Selected Situational Use Factors (N = 4,859)

Predictive Variable	Unstandardized Regression Coefficients		F-Ratio	
	Total Model	Revised Model	Total Model	Revised Model
Church attendance	-0.365	-0.541	33.0	51.5
Religious commitment	-0.104	-0.132	19.6	21.8
Dating frequency	0.315	0.414	144.7	192.5
Number of school activities	-0.120	-0.146	15.8	18.1
Identification with team sports groups	did not enter	-0.252	not sig.	11.9
Identification with rock music listening groups	0.283	0.533	23.6	63.1
Identification with 4-wheel drive groups	0.250	0.423	16.4	34.9
Identification with organized music groups (band)	-0.177	-0.269	9.5	16.6
Identification with college bound group	-0.149	-0.273	6.4	16.2
Identification with religious groups	did not enter	-0.202	not sig.	5.9
Identification with school club groups	-0.133	did not enter	4.1	not sig.
Identification with pothead groups	2.261	3.305	692.7	1,213.7
Identification with soul music listening groups	-0.126	-0.258	6.5	20.0
Friends use drugs	0.874	1.307	25.8	43.2
Wish for acceptance	0.986	0.959	20.5	14.5
Friends do not use drugs	-0.466	-0.641	14.2	20.1
Use of soft drugs at home	1.021	excluded	534.3	not applicable
Use of soft drugs at social events	0.633	1.534	185.9	1,124.6
Use of soft drugs in cars	0.904	excluded	336.5	not applicable
Use of soft drugs at friends' homes	0.485	excluded	109.1	not applicable
Intercept	29.8	26.8		
Adjusted Coefficient of Determination $\bar{R}^2$	0.722	0.627		

Table 6: Regression Analysis For Selected Independent Variables and Hard Drug Use Among Rural Youths in Georgia: Presented in Total Variable Model Form and in Revised Model Form Excluding Selected Situational Factors (N = 4,859)

Predictive Variable	Unstandardized Regression Coefficients		F-Ratio	
	Total Model	Revised Model	Total Model	Revised Model
Church attendance	-0.188	-0.302	15.4	26.5
Dating frequency	did not enter	0.067	not sig.	7.1
Number of school activities	-0.046	did not enter	4.1	not sig.
Identification with team sports groups	did not enter	-0.172	not sig.	8.1
Identification with rock music listening groups	did not enter	0.195	not sig.	11.3
Identification with 4-wheel drive groups	0.171	0.310	12.1	24.6
Identification with college bound group	did not enter	-0.127	not sig.	5.3
Identification with pothead group	0.891	1.719	171.2	442.4
Wish for acceptance	0.640	0.966	14.6	22.2
Hard drug use at home	1.720	excluded	993.9	not applicable
Hard drug use at social events	0.717	2.465	107.5	1,353.3
Hard drug use in cars	0.864	excluded	137.1	not applicable
Hard drug use at friends' homes	0.968	excluded	241.7	not applicable
Intercept	51.0	48.6		
Adjusted Coefficient of Determination $\bar{R}^2$	0.626	0.438		

REFERENCES

Abelson, R.P., and Tukey, J.W. 1970. "Efficient Conversion of Non-Metric Information Into Metric Information." in The Quantitative Analysis of Social Problems, E. Tufts (ed.), Addison Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts.

Adler, P.T., and Lotecka, L. 1973. "Drug Use Among High School Students: Patterns and Correlates." The International Journal of Addictions 8(3): 537-548.

Akers, Ronald L. 1973. "Sutherland's Differential Association Theory." Deviant Behavior. Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc. pp. 35-47.

Akers, R.L., Krohn, M.D., Lanza-Kaduce, L., and Radosevich, M. 1979. "Social Learning and Deviant Behavior: A Specific Test of a General Theory." American Sociological Review 44 (August): 636-655.

Blackford, L.St.C. 1977. Summary Report-Surveys of Student Drug Use, San Mateo County, California. Department of Health and Welfare, San Mateo County, California.

Blum, R. 1969. Students and Drugs. Jossey Bass Publishers.

Burkett, Steven R., and White, Mervin. 1974. "Hellfire and Delinquency: Another Look." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 13(December): 455-464.

Cushman, P. 1971. "Methadone Maintenance In Hard-Core Criminal Addicts: Economic Effects." New York State Journal of Medicine 71: 1768-1774.

Fischler, M.L. 1975-75. "Drug Usage In Rural, Small-Town New England." Journal of Altered States of Consciousness 2(2): 171-183.

Forslund, M.A. 1977-78. "Drug Use and Delinquent Behavior of Small Town and Rural Youth." Journal of Drug Education 7(3): 219-224.

Glaser, Daniel. 1956. "Criminality Theories and Behavioral Theories." American Journal of Sociology 61(March): 433-444.

Glaser, Daniel. 1960. "Differential Association and Criminological Prediction." Social Problems 8(Summer): 6-14.

Gersick, Kelin E., Grady, Katherine, Sexton, Elizabeth, and Lyons, Michael. 1981. "Personality and Sociodemographic Factors In Adolescent Drug Use." in Drug Abuse and the American Adolescent, D.J. Lettiere and J.P. Ludford (eds.), NIDA Research Monograph #38. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. pp. 39-56.

Harrell, Adele V. and Cisin, Ira H. 1981. "Drug Abuse In Rural America." Department of Health and Human Services (Publication number 81-1050), U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Hardt, R.H., and Peterson-Hardt, S. 1977. "On Determining the Quality of the Delinquency Self-Report Method." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 44: 247-261.

Heiligman, A.C. 1973. "A Survey of Drug Use In A Rural Minnesota Senior High School," Drug Forum 2(2): 173-177.

Ianni, F.A. 1973. "Attitudes Toward the Relationship Among Street-Relief, Advertising and Youthful Drug Abuse In Two Recent Field Studies." in Drug Use In America: Problem In Perspective, Vol. 2, National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. pp. 612-622.

Inciardi, J.A., and Chambers, C.D. 1972. "Unreported Criminal Involvement of Narcotic Addicts." Journal of Drug Issues 2(Spring): 57-64.

Johnston, Lloyd D., Bachman, J.G., and O'Malley, P.M. 1979. 1979 Highlights Drugs and Nation's High School Students Five-Year National Trends, DHEW publication number (ADM) 80-390, Washington, D.C.

Josephson, E. 1971. "Trends in Adolescent Marijuana Use." in Drug Use: Epidemiological and Sociological Approaches, E. Josephson and E. Carroll (eds.), Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, Washington, D.C.: pp. 177-205.

Judd, L., Gunderson, E., Alexander, G., Attewell, P., Buckingham, B., Blau, E., Crichton, J., Mandell, A., and Schuckit, J. 1973. "Youth Drug Survey." in Drug Use In America: Problem In Perspective, Vol. 2, National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Kandel, D.B., Treiman, D., Faust, R., and Single, E. 1976. "Adolescent Involvement In Legal and Illegal Drug Use: A Multiple Classification Analysis." Social Forces 55(2): 438-458.

Kim, J. 1975. "Multi-Variate Analysis of Ordinal Variables," American Journal of Sociology, 81: 261-298.

Kirk, Raymond S. 1979. "Drug Use Among Rural Youth." in Youth Drug Abuse, G.M. Beschner and A.S. Friedman (eds.), Lexington Books, Lexington, Massachusetts, pp. 379-407.

Labovitz, S. 1970. "The Assignment of Numbers to Rank Order Categories," American Sociological Review 35: 515-524.

Linder, R.L., Lerner, S.E., and Burke, E. 1974. "Drugs In The Junior High School." Journal of Psychedelic Drugs 6(1): 43-49.

Lombrillo, J.R., and Hain, J.D. 1972. "Patterns of Drug Use In A High School Population." American Journal of Psychiatry 128: 836-841.

Marden, P.G., and Kolodner, D. 1977. "Alcohol Use and Abuse Among Adolescents." NCAI, 026533.

McIntosh, William Alex, Fitch, Starla D., Wilson, J. Bronton, Nyberg, Kenneth. 1981. "The Effect of Mainstream Religious Social Centrals on Adolescent Drug Use In Rural Areas." Review of Religious Research 23(1): 54-75.

Napier, Ted L., Bachtel, D.C., and Carter, M.V. 1982. "Factors Associated With Illegal Drug Use In Rural Georgia." Paper presented at the 1982 Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists, Orlando, Florida.

Napier, Ted L., and Pratt, Mary Christine. 1982. "Frequency of Drug Use Among Rural High School Students." in Rural Crime: Integrating Research and Prevention, T.J. Carter, G.H. Phillips, J.F. Donnermeyer, and T.N. Wurschmidt (eds.) Allenheld Asmun Publishing Company, Totowa, New Jersey. pp. 104-123.

Napier, Ted L., Carter, Timothy J., and Pratt, Mary Christine. 1981. "Correlates of Alcohol and Marijuana Use Among Rural High School Students." Rural Sociology 46(2): 319-332.

National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse. 1973. Drug Use In America: Problem In Perspective, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. (Second Report).

National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse. 1972. Marijuana: A Signal of Misunderstanding, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. (First Report).

Patch, Vernon D. 1973. "Public Health Aspects of Adolescent Drug Use." in Drug Use In America: Problem In Perspective, Vol. 2, National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.: 975-1077.

Pittel, S.M. 1973. "The Etiology of Youthful Drug Involvement." in Drug Use In America: Problem In Perspective, Vol. 2, National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.: 879-913.

Schumann, S.H., and Polkowski, J. 1975. "Drug and Risk Perceptions of 9th Grade Students: Sex Differences and Similarities." Community Mental Health Journal 11(2): 184-194.

Single, E., Kandel, D., and Johnson, B.D. 1975. "Reliability and Validity of Drug Use Responses In a Large Scale Longitudinal Survey." Journal of Drug Issues 5: 426-443.

Smart, R.G. 1976. The New Drinkers, Teenage Use and Abuse of Alcohol. Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario, Toronto.

Sorosiak, F., Thomas, L.E., and Balet, F.N. 1976. "Adolescent Drug Use: An Analysis." Psychological Reports 38(1): 211-221.

Sutherland, Edwin H. 1939. Principles of Criminology, (3rd edition). J.B. Lippincott, Chicago.

Sutherland, Edwin H., and Cressey, Donald R. 1978. "A Sociological Theory of Criminal Behavior." Chapter 4 in Criminology. J.B. Lippincott, Chicago. pp. 77-98.

Tolone, W.L., and Dermott, D. 1975. "Some Correlates of Drug Use Among High School Youth In A Midwestern Rural Community." The International Journal of The Addictions 10(5): 761-777.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1981. Treatment Research Notes, Public Health Service, Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration. p. 5.